REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005, having a shortened statutory period set to expire June 27, 2005. In the present amendment, **cancel** Claims 1-6, 8-13, 17 and 22-25 are cancelled, **amend** Claims 15-18, 21 and 27 are amended, and **add** Claims 28-35 are added. Upon entry of the proposed amendment, Claims 15-16, 18-19, 21 and 27-35 will be pending.

Applicants appreciate the time and courtesy extended by the Examiner during a teleconference conducted on June 24, 2005. While no agreement was reached, the Examiner did recommend that the claims be amended to claim features that differentiate the present invention (which adjusts slew rates in hard disk drives) and the cited art, which teaches adjusting slew rates in IC chips. Applicants believe that the present amendment claims features that do not read on the cited art. Applicants' undersigned representative would welcome a telephone call from the Examiner if the Examiner believes such a call would promote the pending claims to allowance.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claim 27 is objected to for the inadvertent capitalization of the word "such." The present amendment has corrected this error, and thus Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 5 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected **Claim 1** as being unpatentable over *McClure* (U.S. Patent No. 5,305,268) in view of *Faunce* (U.S. Patent No. 5,081,646). In paragraph 12 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected **Claim 2** as being unpatentable over *McClure* and *Faunce* in view of *Zou* (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,101 – "*Zou*"). Similarly, in paragraph 17 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected

Claim 3 as being unpatentable over *McClure* and *Faunce* in view of *Zou*. In paragraph 21 of the present Office Action, **Claim 4** is rejected over *McClure* and *Faunce* in further view of *Sharpe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,441 – "*Sharpe*"). In paragraph 25 of the present Office Action, **Claims 5 and 6** are rejected over *McClure* and *Faunce* in further view of *Nilsson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,052 – "*Nilsson*"). In paragraph 30 of the present Office Action, **Claim 8** is rejected over *McClure* in view of *Faunce* and in further view of *Pirzadeh* (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,964 – "*Pirzadeh*"). In paragraph 39 of the present Office Action, **Claims 9-10** are rejected over *McClure, Faunce* and *Pirzadeh* in further view of *Kuroiwa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,432,731 – "*Kuroiwa*"). In paragraph 44 of the present Office Action, **Claim 11** is rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Sharpe*. In paragraph 48 of the present Office Action, **Claims 12-13** are rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Nilsson*. In paragraph 53 of the present Office Action, **Claim 15** is rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce* and *Pirzadeh*. In paragraph 62 of the present Office Action, **Claims 16-17** are rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Kuroiwa*. In paragraph 68 of the present Office Action, **Claims 18-19** are rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Nilsson*. In paragraph 73 of the present Office Action, **Claim 21** is rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce* and *Pirzadeh*. In paragraph 82 of the present Office Action, **Claims 22-23** are rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Kuroiwa*. In paragraph 88 of the present Office Action, **Claims 24-25** are rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Pirzadeh* and *Nilsson*. In Paragraph 93 of the present Office Action, **Claim 27** is rejected in view of *McClure, Faunce, Kuroiwa* and *Zou*. Applicants respectfully traverse all pending rejections.

None of the cited art is directed to adjusting slew rates in control signals for hard disk drives, as presently claimed and supported, *inter alia*, on page 8, lines 8-10 of the present specification.

With reference to exemplary Claim 27, none of the cited art teaches or suggests "a table containing an optimum value of said control signal slew rate, said optimum value being dependent on a quantity of hard disk drives connected to said host system and an error rate measured in the hard disk drives using Error Correction Codes (ECC), wherein said host system sets said optimum value of said control signal slew rate in said control driver upon said host

system determining said quantity of hard disk drives and said error rate in the hard disk drives." None of the cited art is directed to hard disk drives, nor particularly the use of ECC to determined slew rates. (See, *inter alia*, page 18, lines 13-15 of the present specification for support.)

With reference to exemplary Claim 28, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that "the table is stored in an ATA Interface Circuit (ATAIFC) in the hard disk drive." Similarly, the cited art does not teach that "the table is stored in an AT Controller (ATC) in the host system," as claimed in exemplary Claim 29. (See, *inter alia*, page 15, lines 26-28 of the present specification for support.)

With reference to exemplary Claim 30, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest that "the optimum value for the control signal slew rate is further dependent on whether a **standard HDD cable** connecting the host system to the hard disk drive has 40 or 80 wires, wherein a HDD cable having 80 wires includes grounding lines allocated between wires in the cable to reduce cross-talk noise, and wherein the data signal slew rate is set higher if the HDD cable has 80 wires rather than 40 wires." Such a feature is available only to HDD systems, and not to IC's. (See, *inter alia*, page 12, lines 3-4 and page 15, lines 6-7 of the present specification for support.)

With reference to exemplary Claim 31, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a "Driver/Receiver Unit (DRU)" that uses a "Slew Rate Controller (SRC) signal to a plurality of switches, wherein each switch is turned to a first or second position according to a bit in the SRC signal" to set a slew rate. (See, *inter alia*, pages 13-14 and Figure 3 of the present specification for support.)

CONCLUSION

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed features of the pending claims, Applicants respectfully request a notice of allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0466.**

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)